



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ml

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,781	07/02/2003	Cheryl A. Monachino	LM(F)6221	4387

26294 7590 03/08/2007
TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

CHAWAN, SHEELA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/612,781	Applicant(s) MONACHINO ET AL.	
	Examiner Sheela C. Chawan	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Dec 11, 2006 has been entered.

Claims 1- 20 are pending in the application.

The indicated allowability of claims 1-10 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Yeredor et al., (US. 2004/0240542 A1). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1- 9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeredor et al., (US. 2004/0240542 A1).

As to claim 1, Yeredor discloses a method of analyzing video surveillance data from a plurality of video inputs recording entrants to a secured location (page 3, paragraph 0028 and 0030), comprising:

constructing a plurality of entrant profiles, detailing typical attributes of the entrants, via data mining algorithms (page 5, paragraph 0036);

analyzing video inputs, with a plurality of independent automated decision-making systems each determining if an abnormal condition exists based upon the constructed profiles (note, automated decision making system corresponds to computer when computer instruction embedded with a specifically developed computer program. The program is operator in the analysis of a sequence of video images received from a video covering a security sensitive area, page 5, paragraph 0035); and

processing the determinations of the plurality of decision-making systems to determine if an alarm condition exists (page 5, paragraph 0035, page 6, paragraph 0040).

As to claim 2, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 1, wherein the method further includes the step of identifying objects within the video inputs and recording (page 2, paragraph 0017) this information as part of the entrant profiles (page 5, paragraph 0035, page 8, paragraph 0048).

As to claim 3, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 1, wherein the secured area is a building, and at least one of the plurality of video inputs record an area adjacent to one of the entrances to the building (page 5, paragraph 0034, page 6, paragraph 0039, page 8, paragraph 0048).

As to claim 4, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 3, wherein the secured area is an airport (page 3, paragraph 0030).

As to claim 6, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 1, wherein at least one of the plurality of decision-making systems interprets a temporal model of the video input extracted over a plurality of video frames (page 3, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraph 0031, page 5, paragraph 0035, page 5, paragraph 0036, page 7, paragraph 0044).

As to claim 7, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 1, wherein the step of processing the determinations of the decision-making systems includes combining a plurality of outputs of the decision-making systems into a single system output (fig 4A, page 5, paragraph 0035).

As to claim 8, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 7, wherein the single system output is a weighted linear combination of the outputs of the plurality of decision-making systems (page 4, paragraph 0032).

As to claim 9, Yeredor discloses a method as set forth in claim 1i, wherein the step of processing the determinations of the decision-making systems includes selecting one of the plurality of decision-making systems and accepting its determination (page 4, paragraph 003).

As to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 12, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim ii, wherein the entrant profiles include the typical time of entry and place of entry

Art Unit: 2624

by an entrant to the building (page 3, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraph 0031, page 5, paragraph 0035 and 0036, page 7, paragraph 0044).

As to claim 13, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 11, wherein the computer program product further includes at least one pattern recognition classifier that identifies objects within the video inputs and records this information within the database (page 8, paragraph 0049).

As to claim 14, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 13, wherein the number of people present in an image is included in the recorded information within the database (page 2, paragraph 0017, page 5, paragraph 0035, page 8, paragraph 0048).

As to claim 15, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 13, wherein the entrant profiles include items typically carried by the entrant (page 3, paragraph 0027, page 4, paragraph 0031, page 5, paragraph 0035 and 0036, page 7, paragraph 0044).

As to claim 16, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 11, wherein the arbitrator is a fuzzy logic system (page 4, paragraph 0031, page 6, paragraph 0040).

As to claim 17, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 11, wherein the system includes an alarm that notifies a human operator when an alarm condition exists (fig 1, 18, fig 5A, 246).

As to claim 18, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 17, wherein the alarm recognizes at least two levels of alarm condition, such that

Art Unit: 2624

the alarm notifies a human operator at the first level of alarm condition and sounds (page 3, paragraph 0030) a generally audible alarm at the second level of alarm condition (page 4, paragraph 0031, page 7, paragraph 0046 and 0047).

As to claim 19, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim ii, wherein the data mining portion includes an artificially intelligent trained program that retrieves information from external data sources (page 2, paragraph 0017, page 5, paragraph 0036).

As to claim 20, Yeredor discloses a computer program product as set forth in claim 19, wherein the external data sources include at least one preselected Internet web page (page 3, paragraph 0030).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not

commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeredor et al., (US. 2004/0240542 A1), as applied to claims 1-9 and 11- 20 in view of Donoho et al., (US. 20040177053 A 1).

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Yeredor discloses video surveillance systems and more particularly to a video content analysis- based detection, surveillance and alarm management system.

Yeredor is silent about a neural network classifier.

Donoho computer – implemented behavior detection methods and systems. More particularly, the present invention relates to behavior detection methods and systems that determine whether data that is representative of behavior fits a pre-determined advanced scenario. The system comprises of:

wherein the plurality of decision-making systems includes a neural network classifier (page 3, paragraph 0048, page 9, paragraph 0087, page 11, paragraph 0104).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Yeredor to include wherein the plurality of decision-making systems includes a neural network classifier. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify by the teaching of Donoho, in which specifically describe aspects of that behavior related to both events and entities that are associated with that behavior, and

Art Unit: 2624

subsequently monitor, on an ongoing basis, for the combination of events and entities that are indicative of the behavior of interest (as suggested by Donoho page 1, paragraph 0007).

Other prior art cited

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fennell et al., (US. 20040061781 A1) discloses method of digital video surveillance utilizing threshold detection and coordinate tracking.

Fennell et al., (US. 20040085440 A1) discloses method of digital video surveillance utilizing a dual camera monitoring system.

Rotholtz (US.20040223054 A1) discloses multi-purpose video surveillance.

Tsuji (US. 4,839,631) discloses monitor control apparatus.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela C Chawan whose telephone number is. 571-272-7446. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7.30 - 6.00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheela Chawan
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2624
March 2, 2007


SHEELA CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER